

**Remarks**

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification and figures only give a general explanation of how the invention works, but fails to give details as to how the invention is actually made.

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 9 and 10 recited the term "several." These claims have been amended to eliminate the reference to several. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 15-19 referred to "task managing applications." This language has been amended to state 'task management' set out in the specification on page 5, line 12, as an example.

Claims 1-8 and 10-14 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Lew et al (US Patent No. 6,385,567).

Lew teaches a personal computer that may have multiple emulators loaded on it and is directed to keeping track of common files that may be loaded between two different emulators. Lew mentions the possibility of a networked PC having remote memory, or executing tasks on a remote computer across the network.

Claims 1-8 and 10-14, as amended, more clearly show that the memory device is connected to a first computer, loaded with the appropriate instructions and data for the operating environment of that computer, disconnected from the first computer and then connected to the host computer. The emulator allows the host computer to replicate the

environment of the first computer and to operate on the data file created by the first computer. These amendments are supported in the specification in several places, such as page 3, lines 3-17 and page 4, line 21 through page 5, line 2.

Claim 1 requires that the memory have instructions and data from a first operating environment, a connector to disconnect the memory from the first computer and connected to a host computer. This is not shown, taught or suggested by Lew, as discussed above. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 2-8 and 10 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 2-8 and 10 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 11 requires that a data file be transferred from a first computer to a memory device, and then disconnecting the memory device from the first computer. The memory device is then connected to the host computer. This is not shown, taught nor suggested by Lew, as discussed above.

Claims 12-14 depend from claim 11 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 12-14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 15-19 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Gaines (US Patent No. 5,961,582).

Gaines teaches the use of a remote computer to interact with a near computer upon which a user is working across a network. There is a filter to prevent the user from interacting with the files on the host computer, unless the user has permission. However, host task management of tasks is not blocked. As discussed in the specification, host task management of tasks is the switching of tasks when the emulated environment is operating.

Further, Gaines teaches that some requests that may violate permissions or other security/integrity parameters may be denied. This is not the same as an environmental shutdown as that term is defined in the specification. Claim 15 has been amended to more clearly point out that the environmental shutdown disables the emulator. This is not shown, taught or suggested by Gaines. It is therefore submitted that claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 16-19 depend from claim 15 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 16-19 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lew as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of Gaines.

As discussed above with regard to claim 1, from which this claim depends, Lew does not teach the system as claimed in claim 1. Gaines does not overcome this deficiency. Neither nor Gaines nor Lew teach an emulator system that has a cable that connects the memory device to a first computer, disconnected from that computer and connected to a host system. It is therefore submitted that claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

The prior art made of record, see PTO-892, and not relied upon, has been considered and is not deemed pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

*Julie L. Reed*

Julie L. Reed

Reg. No. 35,349

**Customer No. 20575**  
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
1030 SW Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205  
503-222-3613